UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,983	03/07/2001	Bob Ebert	PALM-3524.US.P	5877

7590	07/25/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER
ZHOU, TING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/801,983	EBERT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ting Zhou	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _24 May 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.** 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The amendment filed on 24 May 2006 have been received and entered. Claims 1-27 as

amended are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vong et al.

U.S. Patent 6,209,011 (hereinafter "Vong") and Chari et al. U.S. Patent 6,553,416 (hereinafter

"Chari").

Referring to claims 1 and 18, Vong teaches a method and system in an electronic device

comprising a processor, memory unit, display screen and a notification system that alerts users of

an event (Vong: column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this

method and system is capable of receiving a first attention request (call) from an alarm manager

associated with a first application that is associated with a first record entry when the first record

entry requires attention from a user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or

when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from

the user, the notification manager receives this attention request from the alarm manager) (Vong:

column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing the first attention request in a memory when the

first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first record entry requires attention

from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar application requires

attention from the user, the request is sent to the notification manager which is loaded in the

memory of the computer system) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-19), automatically sending a first

request for information to the first application when the first record entry requires attention from

the user, the information associated with the first record entry (when the first record entry

requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the calendar

application requires attention from the user, the interrupt manager sends this request to the first

application, or the notification manager to be executed) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), creating a

notification dialog for displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills

in the information in the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from

the user (when the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the

8:00AM alarm for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification

manager checks to see how the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user

accordingly; for example, if the user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification

system can create a dialog box displaying alarm information, as shown in Figure 7), and

automatically displaying the notification dialog on top of an on-screen display that is generated

by a second application that is active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm

manager that it is 8:00AM and an 8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager

displays the alarm on top of the current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or

displaying a dialog box alarm containing the notification information while other applications are

running) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30).

However, although Vong teaches the deactivation of requests when the user acknowledges the

notification alert (Vong: column 3, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 62-65), Vong fails to

explicitly teach deleting from memory any outstanding attention requests that has been cleared

and no longer needs user's attention. Chari teaches a method and system for managing alerts

similar to that of Vong. In addition, Chari further teaches the deletion of notifications in column

12, lines 10-28. This can also be seen in Figure 4A (reference character "438"). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having teachings of Vong and Chari before him

at the time the invention was made, to modify the notification system and method of Vong to

include the ability to delete notifications, as taught by Chari. One would have been motivated to

make such a combination to delete requests that are no longer active and in need of attention in

order to conserve memory space, time and bandwidth, especially on a small-screen device such

as a personal digital assistant or cellular phone.

Referring to claims 2 and 19, Vong, as modified, disclose determining a plurality of

outstanding attention requests, each associated with a corresponding record entry and a

corresponding application, each of outstanding attention requests still requiring attention from

the user, the plurality of outstanding requests including the first attention request (ability to

determine and handle a plurality of attention requests from multiple applications requiring

attention from the user; this can also include the first attention request, which can be snoozed,

and therefore, still requiring attention from the user) (Vong: column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33).

Referring to claims 10 and 27, Vong, as modified, teach a method and system in which

the electronic device is a palm sized computer system (portable handheld computing device)

(Vong: column 1, lines 63-64).

Referring to claims 3 and 20, Vong, as modified, teach deletion from memory each of the

plurality of outstanding attention requests that have been cleared and no longer need user's

attention (Chari: column 12, lines 10-28 and Figure 4A).

Referring to claims 4-5 and 21-22, Vong fails to explicitly teach the ability to request and

view information regarding the attention requests in a list format. As can be seen from Figure 6,

Chari shows the display of a log window containing the list of alerts that are still active.

Therefore, if there are active attention requests, they can be determined and displayed on a

display screen via a notification dialog that contains a list of these alerts, as recited in column 7,

lines 37-46. Having the teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was

made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification

system and method of Vong to include the list format display of active notifications, as taught by

Chari. It would have been advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow the users

to view and keep track of all active notification alerts together in a log file.

Referring to claims 6-9 and 23-26, while Vong fails to explicitly teach the ability to

request and view the attention request information in detailed format and the singular display of

the details of the attention requests. As can be seen in Figure 5, Chari shows the display of one

detailed notification dialog (alert screen) that contains all the details regarding the alert, i.e., the

date, time, and description of the alert. Therefore, this shows detailed information regarding a

notification can be gathered and singularly displayed on the screen as a detailed notification

dialog. It would then have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the detailed

format of display for the alerts can be requested whether the plurality of attention requests

contain every request except the first attention request, as is the case in claims 6, 7, 23 and 24, or

only the first attention request, as is the case in claims 8, 9, 25 and 26. Having the teachings of

Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the notification system and method of Vong to include

the singular display of detailed notification dialogs, as taught by Chari. It would have been

advantageous for one to utilize such a combination to allow users to view all the details related to

an alert in a single window display.

Referring to claim 11, Vong teaches a method of notification that alerts users of an event

(Vong: column 1, lines 63-66, column 3, lines 62-67 and Figure 3). Specifically, this method is

capable of receiving a first attention request from a first application that is associated with a first

record entry when the first record entry requires attention from a user (when the first record entry

requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm for the calendar

application requires attention from the user, the notification manager receives this attention

request from the alarm manager) (Vong: column 7, lines 32-44), automatically storing the first

attention request in a memory when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when

the first record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00 AM alarm

for the calendar application requires attention from the user, the request is sent to the notification

manager which is loaded in the memory of the computer system) (Vong: column 5, lines 8-19),

determining a plurality of outstanding attention requests wherein each are associated with a

corresponding record entry and a corresponding application, each of the outstanding attention

requests still requiring attention from the user, the plurality of outstanding attention requests

including the first attention request (ability to determine and handle a plurality of attention

requests from multiple applications requiring attention from the user; this can also include the

first attention request, which can be snoozed, and therefore, still requiring attention from the

user) (Vong: column 8, lines 20-24 and 31-33), automatically sending a first request for

information to the first application, the information being associated with the first record entry

and is dependent on the number of outstanding attention requests being managed (a plurality of

alarms can be set for 8:00AM and therefore, when the hardware clock determines that it is

8:00AM, the alarm manager can send a plurality of notifications to the notification manager)

(Vong: column 7, lines 24-31 and column 8, lines 31-39), creating a first notification dialog for

displaying the information, wherein the first application generates and fills in the information in

the notification dialog when the first record entry requires attention from the user (when the first

record entry requires attention from a user, or when it is 8:00AM and the 8:00AM alarm for the

calendar application requires attention from the user, the notification manager checks to see how

the user wants to be notified of the alarm and notifies the user accordingly; for example, if the

user wishes to be notified by a dialog display, the notification system can create a dialog box

displaying alarm information, as shown in Figure 7), automatically displaying the first

notification dialog on top of an on-screen display associated with a second application that is

active (when the notification manager is notified by the alarm manager that it is 8:00AM and an

8:00 AM attention request is pending, the notification manager displays the alarm on top of the

current display on the screen, demonstrated by flashing and/or displaying a dialog box alarm

containing the notification information while other applications are running) (Vong: column 5,

lines 8-17, column 7, lines 14-31 and column 8, lines 16-30); and receiving a request to clear a

current attention request from the plurality of attention requests, the current attention request

taken from the plurality of outstanding attention requests (clearing from the display, i.e. turning

off, the current outstanding attention request, i.e. the displayed notification alarm, once the user

acknowledges he is aware of the notification, via pressing the snooze button for example) (Vong:

column 3, lines 65-67, column 7, lines 62-65 and column 8, lines 16-30). However, although

Vong teaches the deactivation of requests when the user acknowledges the notification alert

(Vong: column 3, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 62-65), Vong fails to explicitly teach deleting

from memory any outstanding attention requests that has been cleared and no longer needs user's

attention. Chari teaches a method and system for managing alerts similar to that of Vong. In

addition, Chari further teaches the deletion of notifications in column 12, lines 10-28. This can

also be seen in Figure 4A (reference character "438"). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art, having teachings of Vong and Chari before him at the time the invention

was made, to modify the notification system and method of Vong to include the ability to delete

notifications, as taught by Chari. One would have been motivated to make such a combination to

delete requests that are no longer active and in need of attention in order to conserve memory

space, time and bandwidth, especially on a small-screen device such as a personal digital

assistant or cellular phone.

Referring to claim 12, Vong, as modified, teach receiving a display request (notification

request) to display a selected record entry associated with a selected attention request from the

plurality of outstanding attention requests (request to display a notification alarm), automatically

switching from the second application (user interface allowing users to schedule an event

notification) to the third application associated with the selected record entry (notification

mechanism responsible for displaying scheduled notifications), displaying the attention request

(turning on the LED or displaying the dialog box) and providing user interface with the selected

record entry through the second application (Vong: column 2, lines 24-26 and 52-58, and column

5, lines 8-18 and 37-42).

Referring to claim 13, Vong, as modified, teach automatically launching the third

application (the notification application is automatically activated upon the occurrence of an

event) and automatically sending the display request to the third application (after the user

schedules an event, the calendar application automatically calls the notification application with

the request) (Vong: column 3, lines 60-65 and column 7, lines 14-30).

Referring to claims 14 and 15, Vong, as modified, teach receiving a request from the user

to clear an attention request (delete an alert) and deleting that alert from memory (ability to

delete a plurality of alerts) (Chari: column 12, lines 13-20).

Referring to claim 16, Vong, as modified, teach receiving a request to suspend the

plurality of outstanding attention requests, suspending each of the plurality of outstanding

attention requests for a predetermined period of time (rescheduling the alarm for an additional

five-minute period), reactivating the second application and displaying the plurality of

outstanding attention requests after a predetermined period of time has elapsed in the second

notification dialog (redisplaying the alarm after the five-minute snooze time has elapsed) (Vong:

column 8, lines 20-30 and further illustrated in Figure 7).

Referring to claim 17, Vong, as modified, teach invoking (displaying) an alarm

simultaneously with the display of the dialog box and the alarm taken from a group consisting

essentially of an audible alarm (audio device), a visual alarm (light), a vibrator (vibration

device), a flashing LED and flashing the notification dialog (Vong: column 4, lines 4-15, column

6, lines 45-57 and column 8, lines 16-30)

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 24 May 2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive:

4.   The applicant argues that the combination of Vong and Chari is improper and would not

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as neither reference explicitly recites the

motivation to combine the references as suggested. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In

response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the

examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the

teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir.

1992). In this case, both Vong and Chari teach an interface for managing and displaying alerts to

the user. Chari states that prior art systems for displaying alerts take up and waste valuable time

and bandwidth, as recited in column 2, lines 39-63; Chari also states that by displaying every

alert, the server manager is taking up valuable bandwidth on the network, increasing the amount

of traffic already on the network and decreases the performance of each computer, in column 2,

lines 57-65. In the two cases cited by the applicant in the remarks, namely *In re Raynes* and *In*

re Deminski, the board stated that the statutory test is whether "the subject matter as a whole

would have been obvious at the time the invention was made" and that the state of knowledge at

the time the invention was made provided some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to make the

particular combination made by the applicant. Chari states that a major goal in the computer

network industry today is to reduce the amount and size of traffic on the network (column 2,

lines 62-63), which is the goal Chari is trying to achieve. Therefore, Chari specifically provides

the motivation of achieving the goal of reducing the amount of traffic on the network and the

desire to remedy prior art deficiencies in order to conserve bandwidth and improve system

processing time; Chari teaches achieving this goal by selectively disabling and deleting items

such as notifications (column 3, lines 21-23 and column 12, lines 10-28). Furthermore, it is

generally known to one skilled in the art, that deletion of items from memory frees up space in

memory storage and therefore improves processing time. In view of the above arguments, the

examiner maintains that the invention achieved by combining the teachings of Vong and Chari

(i.e. a notification system that allows notifications to be deleted) would have been obvious at the

time the invention was made, in order to achieve a major goal in the computer industry, as

explicitly stated by Chari.

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's ·

supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100